

REMARKS

Applicant has rewritten claims 1-6 and 8 as a single new claim 9 which includes a further limitation wherein the tin balls have a spherical surface and wherein the upper pin comprises a concave top conformed to the spherical surface on the bottom tin balls. This change is supported on page 7, lines 17-19 and by Figure 5 wherein the element 31 is conformed to the surface of the ball 41. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

Further, Applicants' claims now call for a single intermediate resilient spring disposed in a space defined by the first and the second spring receptacles and wherein the upper pin, the lower pin and the resilient member of each of the pins are separate formed.

Applicants has also rewritten the Abstract to delete "comprises".

In the aforementioned Office Action, original claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,464,511) in view of Beaman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,738,531).

As recognized by the Examiner, Beaman et al. discloses a similar connector (1) using tin balls (2), see column 3, lines 59-65. It is respectfully submitted that Beaman does

not disclose or suggest tin balls wherein each of the upper pairs comprises a concave top substantially conformed to the spherical surface of the tin balls.

Accordingly, it is Applicants' contention that new claim 9 should be allowed. Further, it is a basic principle of the United States patent laws that it is improper to arbitrarily pick and choose prior art patents and combine selected portions of the selected patents on the basis of the applicant's disclosure to create a hypothetical or fictional combination which allegedly renders a claim obvious unless there is some direction in the selected prior art patents to combine the selected teachings in a manner to negate the patentability of the claimed subject matter. This principle was enunciated over thirty years ago by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in In re Rothermel and Waddell, 125 USPQ 328 (C.C.P.A. 1960). Accordingly, it is Applicants' contention that new claim 9 is clearly distinguished over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, prompt favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



David E. Dougherty  
Reg. No. 19,576  
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 17

October 7, 2004